

REMARKS

The Office Action has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that the issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

The Applicant has amended claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claim set are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 8-21, 24-31, 36-43 and 48 as being indefinite due to the term "substantially simultaneously" being a relative term. In order to overcome the clarity objection the feature of "*the visible and invisible coded data are printed substantially simultaneously*" has been deleted without prejudice. Therefore, we respectfully submit that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Wolff et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,261) in view of Bennett et al (US Patent 5,051,736), further in view of Patterson, Jr et al (US Patent 5,797,002) and further in view of Ur (US Patent Number 6,072,871).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following comments.

Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner has stated at that Ur discloses at column 4, lines 19-54 the feature of "*at the time of printing the computer system associates the type and spatial extent of the coded data with the spatial extent of at least some of the visible information*". However, the applicant

disagrees. The highlighted section of Ur is not relevant to this feature of associating the coded data with the visible information.

At lines 41 to 67 of column 4, Ur disclose that multiple replications of the identifying code pattern are printed on the document. Ur also discloses that an application could be used to maximise the number of replications for a document. Ur states that the replications may appear in such areas of the document as:

- in the margins; and
- in the filed of the printed text.

Importantly, Ur states that "[t]he unique identifying code pattern is in essence a serial number or identifier for the authorised copy which becomes an invisible signature on the printed document".(column 4, lines 26 to 29) **Thus, the patterns only identify the document.**

Therefore, it would be impossible for Ur to determine whether for example a margin had been selected compared to whether a line of text had been selected, since all the patterns are replications only indicative of an identity of the document.

Accordingly, Ur fails to show a computer system which records an association of the type and spatial extent of the coded data with the spatial extent of at least some of the visible information, as required by claim 1.

For the Examiner's understanding we direct attention to the example which was provided in the previous response:

"The corresponding page description 5, stored on the netpage network, describes the individual elements of the netpage. In particular it describes the type and spatial extent (zone) of each interactive element (i.e. text field or button in the example), to allow the netpage system to correctly interpret input via the netpage. The submit button 6, for example has a zone 7 which corresponds to the spatial extent of the corresponding graphic 8." (page 13, lines 7-13)

Thus, the computer system associates the type and spatial extent of the coded data (ie. the coded data is indicative of a text button) with the spatial extent of at least some of the visible information (ie. the graphic of the button). Therefore, when the coded data is sensed, the

computer system can use the indicating data and the association to determine a parameter for the bid transaction (ie. an action of pressing a button to submit a bid transaction).

This association between the spatial extent of coded data and the spatial extent of at least some of the visible information cannot be performed by Ur, as Ur only uses replications of a pattern indicative of only an identity of the entire document.

We therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In the event that the Examiner does not find the above argument persuasive, we respectfully submit that the teachings of Ur should not be combined with the other cited documents. As the Examiner has stated "*Wolff, Bennet and Patterson are concerned with making it easier and faster for the user to enter data*" (page 4 of Office Action). Ur is not concerned with entering data. Ur is specific to identifying and authenticating the document. This apparent throughout Ur, and in particular in the abstract where it states:

"The 'invisible signature' permits detection of documents made by unauthorized copies of software or by unauthorized or improper use of authorized copies."

Thus, Ur is directly concerned with authenticating a printed document. This is in total contrast to Wolff, Bennet and Patterson which relates to entering data.

As required in the MPEP at 2144:

"...rationale for combining references is a recognition, expressly or impliedly in the prior art or drawn from a convincing line of reasoning..."

The Examiner's reasoning that Ur may be combined with Wolff, Bennet and Patterson are not expressed or implied in the prior art as shown above, wherein Ur does not teach or suggest entering data.

Furthermore, the applicant questions the Examiner's reasoning in that Ur teaches authorization of printed documents which is in total contrast to the Examiner's previous

11

comments that Wolff, Bennet and Patterson are combined because they relate to entering data.

Therefore, as required by 35 USC § 103, a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Ur with any of the cited documents, since Ur is not concerned with entering data.

Accordingly, since the Examiner has explicitly stated at the top of page 5 of the Office Action that "*Wolff, Bennet and Patterson fail to teach ... at the time of printing the computer system associates the type and spatial extent of the coded data with the spatial extent of at least some of the visible information*", the rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



PAUL LAPSTUN

Applicant:



JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762